



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/710,813	08/04/2004	Grover Mundell	43576.830009.US1	4812
26582	7590	11/27/2007		
HOLLAND & HART, LLP P.O BOX 8749 DENVER, CO 80201			EXAMINER LY, CHEYNE D	
			ART UNIT 2168	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/27/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/710,813

Applicant(s)

MUNDELL ET AL.

Examiner

Cheyne D. Ly

Art Unit

2168

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-11 and 13-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-11 and 13-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicants' arguments filed August 24, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.
2. The cancellation of claims 2 and 12 has been entered.
3. Claims 1, 3-11, and 13-24 are examined on the merits.

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

4. The rejections of record have been withdrawn as necessitated by claim amendments. Therefore, Applicant's argument directed to withdrawn rejections are moot. As for the argued limitation of "a many-to-many relationship", the argued limitation is not in the claim; therefore, Przekop as newly cited below is not required to disclose said argued limitation.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent

any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1, 3-11, and 13-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Przekop et al. (US 2003/007,8973 A1 Przekop hereafter) taken with Chakraborty et al.

(6,462,754 B1 Chakraborty hereafter).

8. In regard to claim 1, Przekop describes a method for managing electronic transcripts and electronic exhibits performed on at least one processor, the method comprising the steps of: selecting an electronic transcript file to have establish an electronic link with at least one electronic exhibit (page 2, [0012], e.g. each line of the transcript contains a selectable link to the video/audio record so that a permitted viewer, by simply selecting a link, is securely navigated to the corresponding portion of the video/audio record over a public network such as the Internet);

9. synchronizing a media file with the electronic transcript (page 3, [0033], e.g. .PDF files synchronization);

10. identifying at least one electronic exhibit to be electronically linked with the electronic transcript by electronic link association (page 2, [0012], e.g. each line of the transcript contains a selectable link to the video/audio record so that a permitted viewer, by simply selecting a link, is securely navigated to the corresponding portion of the video/audio record over a public network such as the Internet);

11. choosing a type of electronic link between the electronic transcript and the at least one electronic exhibit (page 2, [0012], e.g. each line of the transcript contains a selectable link to the video/audio record so that a permitted viewer, by simply selecting a link, is securely navigated to the corresponding portion of the video/audio record over a public network such as the Internet);

12. applying the electronic link to the electronic transcript such that the electronic transcript and the at least one electronic exhibit are linked to cause the at least one electronic exhibit to automatically displayed as the electronic transcript and the synchronized media file are advanced passed the electronic link (page 3, [0035], e.g. automated system, and page 4, [0036], member reviews 203 desired portions of the video/audio record by selecting the corresponding link in the transcript, as shown in FIG. 3. Thus, when the member clicks on the line number, the software opens the browser window and launches the streaming-video-on-demand services, presenting the desired portion of the video/audio record in its own frame).

13. However, Przekop does not explicitly describe the limitation of a user defined electronic link.

14. Chakraborty describes the limitation of inputting the user defined electronic link (column 15, lines 34-39). While, Przekop describes it would be desirable to embed selectable links in the transcript so that group members could access a desired portion of the video record by selecting the link embedded in the corresponding line of the transcript (page 1, [0011]).

15. Chakraborty describes a need exist to automatic hyperlinking video clips to different parts of a document system (page 3, lines 3-6). While, Przekop describes an improvement in

a system using open standards as much as possible, thus enabling reduced cost to users, ease of implementation, ease of use, and maximum compatibility and portability by embedding selectable links in the transcript so that group members could access a desired portion of the video record by selecting the link embedded in the corresponding line of the transcript (page 1, [0011]). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated by improve the system of Chakraborty to reduce cost to users, ease of implementation, ease of use, and maximum compatibility and portability. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the system of Przekop with the user defined line as described by Chakraborty.

16. In regard to claim 3, Przekop in view of Chakraborty describes activating the applied electronic link; and displaying the at least one electronic exhibit (page 2, [0012], e.g. each line of the transcript contains a selectable link to the video/audio record so that a permitted viewer, by simply selecting a link, is securely navigated to the corresponding portion of the video/audio record over a public network such as the Internet).

17. In regard to claim 4, Przekop in view of Chakraborty describes displaying the electronic transcript in a first window; and displaying the at least one electronic exhibit in at least a second window (Figures 3 and 4, e.g. windows).

5. In regard to claim 5, Przekop in view of Chakraborty describes the step of displaying the at least one electronic exhibit comprises the step of displaying an image (page 4, [0036]).

6. In regard to claim 6, Przekop in view of Chakraborty describes the step of displaying the at least one electronic exhibit comprises playing an audio file (page 2, [0012]).

7. In regard to claim 7, Przekop in view of Chakraborty describes the step of displaying the at

least one electronic exhibit comprises playing a video file (page 2, [0012]).

8. In regard to claim 8, Przekop in view of Chakraborty describes the step of displaying the at least one electronic exhibit comprises playing an audio/video file (page 2, [0012]).

18. In regard to claim 9, Przekop in view of Chakraborty describes appending the media file to the electronic transcript (page 4, [0037], e.g. appending).

19. In regard to claim 10, Przekop in view of Chakraborty describes the step of launching the media file in a media window (Figures 3 and 4, e.g. windows).

20. In regard to claim 11, Przekop in view of Chakraborty describes the step of advancing the electronic transcript along with the media file (page 2, [0012], e.g. each line of the transcript contains a selectable link to the video/audio record so that a permitted viewer, by simply selecting a link, is securely navigated to the corresponding portion of the video/audio record over a public network such as the Internet).

21. In regard to claim 13, Przekop in view of Chakraborty describes the step of recognizing the characters of the at least one electronic exhibit to provide character searching of the at least one electronic exhibit (page 4, [0042], e.g. searched for occurrences of the particular term).

22. In regard to claim 14, Przekop in view of Chakraborty describes the step of importing a file to a project, the file selected from a group of files consisting of electronic transcript files and electronic exhibit files (page 5, [0050] to [0055]).

23. In regard to claims 15, 16, 21, 22, and 24, Przekop in view of Chakraborty describes, in addition to the disclosures cited above, the transcript manager, an organization and control module (Figures 1 and 2 in their entirety), memory (Figure 1), and display (Figures 3 and 4).

24. In regard to claims 17 and 18, Przekop in view of Chakraborty describes a network via broadband connection or wireless connection (page 3, column 2, [0032]).

25. In regard to claims 19 and 20, Przekop in view of Chakraborty describes "floppy disk of the transcript" (page 4, [0044], e.g. CD-ROM).

CONCLUSION

26. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

27. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

28. Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the

Art Unit: 2168

specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

29. For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199. The USPTO's official fax number is 571-272-8300.

30. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. Dune Ly, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0716. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8 A.M. to 4 P.M.

31. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo, can be reached on (571) 272-3642.

C. Dune Ly
Primary Examiner
11/16/07

